

United States Patent and Trademark Office

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,965	07/11/2003	Masaaki Ozawa	116515	2871
25944	7590 11/10/2005		EXAM	INER
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC			MULLIS, JEFFREY C	
P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1711	
			DATE MAIL ED. 11/10/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		\mathcal{W}				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/616,965	OZAWA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jeffrey C. Mullis	1711				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFI after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNI R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO atute, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1	8 August 2005.					
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ ⁻	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
,						
closed in accordance with the practice und	er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.l	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3</u> is/are rejected. 7) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>4 and 5</u> is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction are	drawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the col 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) objected to the drawing(s) be held in abeya rrection is required if the drawing	nnce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document	nents have been received. nents have been received in a priority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB Paper No(s)/Mail Date) Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/616,965

Art Unit: 1711

All remaining rejections/objections follow.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Erneta (US 3,846,453).

See the previous Office action at the paragraph bridging pages 2 and 3 et seq

Claims 4 and 5 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed 8-18-05 is insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1-3 based upon Erneta as set forth in the last Office action because: There appear to be substantial differences in concentrations between examples 7 and 6 of the patent and the data in the declaration as well as relative amounts of reactants (although the ratio of amounts of melamine and formalin appear consistent with the patent). While applicants may of course reduce quantities of reactants to scale up or down the differences in concentrations varies fron the examples of patentees by differenct factors and concentrations appear to vary also. Also applicants have not added the equivalent of 2000 g of water to the melamine as set out in the patent table. Lastly, given how close the particle size is to the required particle size it is not clear that example 7 of the patent does not meet the limitations of the claims.

Application/Control Number: 10/616,965

Art Unit: 1711

Applicant's arguments filed 8-18-05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With re to the reference to the amino resin (silica) particle sizes in the patent, these particles contain silica as set out at column 1, lines 19-25 of the patent. With re to the issue of whether colloidal silica would reasonably appear during patentees process, applicants own declaration purportedly according to the patent observed particles which were of less than 4 nm isolated from the reaction mixture of patentees. It is therefore clear that colloidal particles are generated during patentees process. With re to In re Robertson the term "necessarily" cited therein refers to inevitability. The issue of wether or not a particular characteristic is present in a reference is not an issue where a working example is relied upon in that only one outcome is possible, not various outcomes due to picking and choosing from disclosures and combining them. With re to applicants' comments re the issue of whether or not Erneta inherently discloses those limitations of the claims not explicitly taught, the defects in applicants declaration are set out above.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 1711

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jeffrey C. Mullis at telephone number 571 272 1075.

Jeffrey C. Mullis J Mullis Art Unit 1711

JCM

10-27-05

Jeffrey Mullis Primary Examiner Art Unit 1711